LP
F
5012
1863
L6

NARRATIVE OF THE DISPUTE

BETWEEN THE

BISHOP OF ONTARIO

AND THE

CONGREGATION OF ST. GEORGE'S, KINGSTON,

RELATIVE TO THE

APPOINTMENT OF DR. LAUDER.

TORONTO:
W. C. CHEWETT & CO., PRINTERS, KING STREET EAST.
1863.

NARRATIVE OF THE DISPUTE

BETWEEN THE

BISHOP OF ONTARIO AND THE CONGREGATION OF ST. GEORGE'S, KINGSTON,

RELATIVE TO THE APPOINTMENT OF DR. LAUDER.

Before entering on the above narrative, in which it is intended to let the opposing parties speak for themselves as much as possible, it will be necessary to state a few matters of fact as to date and circumstances, which are briefly as follows.

Early in October, 1862, the late Rector, Dr. Stuart, died, and the right of presentation vested in the Synod of Ontario, which was summoned to meet at Ottawa in the beginning of November. For various reasons, it was supposed the Synod would present to this Rectory forthwith, whatever course it might see fit to pursue on the general question of patronage, and, as the city of Kingston was well represented in that body, no great anxiety was felt as to the result. But, as is now well known, the Synod finally determined, after a long and warm debate, on vesting the patronage entirely in the Bishop, the sanction of the lay majority being obtained, it is said, by the Bishop's promising not to use this power to make an appointment which would be distasteful to a congregation; or, as he subsequently qualified it, that "he would not *knowingly* appoint a Rector who was *decidedly* disliked by the people." It is worthy of note that all the parishes in and about Kingston voted against this measure.

Shortly afterwards (November 8th), the Synod broke up without any intimation whatever being given as to the person on whom the Rectory would be bestowed; but as the Kingston Delegates had stated that the Bishop had promised to make no appointment likely to be distasteful to a congregation, and as it was universally supposed that his Lordship was well aware of Dr. Lauder's extreme unpopularity in that locality, no action was taken in the matter till it became known (on Monday, the 17th November) that the Bishop, who had only arrived in Kingston the Saturday previous, had appointed Dr. Lauder Rector of Kingston.

Dr. Lauder was inducted early the next morning, Tuesday, the 18th, and on Wednesday, the 19th, a very large and influential meeting of

132511

Parishioners was held, at which the following resolutions were passed with but two dissenting voices:—

1st. Moved by S. Mucklestone, Esq., seconded by W. Rudston, Esq.
That, in the opinion of this meeting, the appointment of the Ven. Dr. Lauder is highly unacceptable to the Parish of St. George. *Carried.*

2nd. Moved by Thomas Askew, Esq., seconded by George Oliver, Esq.
"That under these circumstances, it is scarcely possible that the ministrations of the reverend gentleman can be pleasing or profitable to himself or his intended flock." *Carried.*

3rd. Moved by C. S. Ross, Esq., seconded by R. J. Cartwright, Esq.
That the Congregation of St. George's Church have learned with great regret, that the Lord Bishop of Ontario has appointed the Ven. Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston without reference to and in disregard of the well-known wishes of the Congregation; and from the many painful rumors which have connected Dr. Lauder's name with the late election of the Lord Bishop and the Rectory, it is in the opinion of this meeting highly detrimental to the best interests of the Congregation, and of the Church, that the appointment should have been made, or, having been made, that it should be maintained. *Carried.*

4th. Moved by J. Watkins, Esq., seconded by R. Rudston, Esq.
That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Lord Bishop of Ontario, and to the Rev. Dr. Lauder. *Carried.*

T. W. Robison, *Chairman.*
R. J. Cartwright, *Secretary.*

It is to be observed that, independently of the belief of the congregation that Dr. Lewis was very well aware of Dr. Lauder's great unpopularity among them, it was generally supposed that Dr. Lewis owed his election mainly to Dr. Lauder's persevering exertions on his behalf. Certain it is that Dr. Lauder had canvassed most indefatigably during the very lengthened period preceding the election, and also that reports were most extensively circulated during that time to the effect that he was to receive this particular piece of preferment on the demise of Dr. Stuart, a man of more than 80 years of age.

How far the congregation were or were not justified in holding that the mere fact of the existence of these reports, when coupled with Dr. Lauder's very active canvas for Dr. Lewis, constituted *per se* a very serious obstacle to his appointment, is a nice question. Probably they would have been wiser to have abstained from taking notice of a report which from its very nature was incapable of legal proof, since no man could suppose that the Bishop or Dr. Lauder would either give evidence against themselves or reduce such a compact to writing.

But on the other hand, it is clear that men in the position of the Bishop and the (present) Dean of Ontario ought to have been most cautious not to give any occasion for scandal, particularly where, as in the present case, the surrounding circumstances were such as to lend far too much outward probability to such rumours; and it is clear als

that their currency would, to say the least, seriously endanger Dr. Lauder's usefulnesss among his future flock.

The foregoing resolutions were at once published in the Kingston papers, and drew forth the following letters :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BRITISH WHIG.

Sir,—In your account of the indignation meeting held yesterday at St. George's School-house, you have, doubtless inadvertently, made the meeting, and myself in particular, express a stronger opinion as to the supposed promise of this Rectory to Dr. Lauder, in return for his services in promoting the election of the Bishop, than my words or the resolution itself would warrant.

What I did say, in seconding the resolution which it was my painful duty to support, was that this statement had been so publicly and universally circulated in this diocese, that it had risen from mere street gossip to a public scandal, and that, granting it to be altogether untrue, it did, nevertheless, under the circumstances, constitute a very strong reason why any other man in the diocese but Dr. Lauder should have received this appointment.

This view the meeting endorsed by passing the resolution in question; but I did not assert, nor do I think the meeting meant to imply, anything further. My reasons for believing that the simple fact of the wide-spread existence of these reports constitutes a most serious objection I shall be ready to give, or rather to repeat, when called on, but I must observe that they do not, by any means, form the sole grounds for dissatisfaction with this appointment, as might, otherwise, be surmised from the language of your report.

I remain your obedient servant,

Nov. 20th, 1862. R. J. Cartwright.

THE BISHOP'S LETTER.

To T. W. Robison, Esq., Chairman of Meeting held in St. George's School House, Nov. 19th, 1862.

Sir,—I am sorry to learn that the appointment of Archdeacon Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston is so distasteful to the meeting at which you presided.

Exercising the patronage placed in my hands by the Synod of the Diocese, I appointed to the Rectory a clergyman of 18 years standing, a Doctor of Laws of Dublin, who is a Rector of a Parish not second to Kingston, where he labors to the entire satisfaction of the parishioners, whose esteem and affection he has secured.

The resolutions assign no reason for the dislike entertained by the meeting toward the Archdeacon, except that "many painful rumours have connected Dr. Lauder's name with the late election of the Lord Bishop of the Rectory." Now I venture to say, that to drag a respectable clergyman's name before the public, to denounce him as has been done, on the authority and grounds of "painful rumours," is not conduct becoming the character of gentlemen or English Churchmen. What the rumour is which has excited so much ill-feeling, I find plainly stated in the *Whig* of Nov. 19th, and I pronounce it to be a wicked falsehood, which could only have been conceived or uttered by a thoroughly depraved and ignoble mind.

Before the Archdeacon's induction, he took the following oath. "I do swear that I have made no symonical payment, contract or promise, directly or indirectly, by myself or by any other, to my knowledge or with my con-

sent, to any person or persons whatsoever, for or concerning the procuring or containing the Rectory of Kingston," so that the meeting at which you presided has affirmed that the Archdeacon has been guilty of perjury, and that your Bishop is a "a particeps criminis."

I have nothing to add, but to express how humiliated I feel at the thought that so many members of the Church could by any possibility be found to endorse by resolution a "rumour" which is both wicked and devoid of a shadow of foundation.

I am, very truly,

J. T. Ontario.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BRITISH WHIG.

Sir,—The letter of the Lord Bishop of Ontario which appeared in yesterday's *Whig* is so evidently written in a moment of apparent and perhaps pardonable irritation, produced as I am willing to believe, by the unfortunate mistake in the *British Whig's* account of the late meeting; that I prefer learning what his Lordship has to say in answer to Mr. Cartwright's note correcting that mistake, before I reply further to his Lordship's letter.

I am, yours,

Nov. 21st, 1862. T. W. Robison.

Alwington House, Nov. 22nd, 1862.

My Dear Dr. Robison,—In reply to your letter, which appears in to-day's newspapers, let me say, in the first place, that I did not write to you in a "moment of irritation," but under the influence of deep moral indignation.

I most willingly accept the assurance tendered to me yesterday in the presence of Mr. Denroche, that you did not believe in the base "rumour," and that Mr. Cartwright gave the interpretation of the Resolution in his note of Friday last.

But I must be allowed to affirm that the speeches of Messrs. Ross and Cartwright, taken in connexion with the third Resolution, more than warrant the inference of the Editor of the *British Whig*, who was present at the meeting, viz.: that the meeting endorsed the "rumour" "that Dr. Lauder canvassed for Dr. Lewis on condition that, if successful, he should be rewarded with the Rectory of Kingston." This foul charge was made in terms not explicit enough, perhaps, to justify an action for defamation, but sufficiently plain to wound my feelings in the cruelest manner.

I now take leave of this subject, so far as newspaper writing is concerned, and appeal from the verdict of St. George's Congregation to that of the diocese at large with calm confidence.

I trust you will not suppose that I intended to be discourteous to you in not furnishing you with the manuscript of my letter before seuding it to the press; the fact is, that the Meeting has addressed me only through the press, as I have received no written communication from its Secretary or Chairman, and replied to the Resolutions of the Meeting by addressing its Chairman through the same channel.

I am, yours, very truly,

J. T. Ontario.

T. W. Robison, Esq., M.D.

On Monday the 24th November, the Bishop called a meeting of the congregation, and addressed them in a manner described by the *Whig* of that date, as follows:—

ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH.

Another large Meeting of the Parishioners of St. George's Parish was held this afternoon at the Sunday School House, called by the Bishop himself, who took the chair. His Lordship certainly did not throw oil on the troubled waters. He was very angry, and expressed himself very angrily. At the conclusion of his speech he left the Meeting, and it broke up discordantly. It is but fair to add that a good many friends of the Bishop were present:

James A. Henderson, Esq., moved that the Bishop should take the chair, which he accordingly did. The Bishop then proceeded to give his opinion of the resolution passed at the Indignation Meeting. He said he was led to call this meeting in consequence of the Indignation Meeting which had taken place in the school-house. He was first inclined not to call this meeting, as being undignified on his part, but had since changed his mind. He did not think he had been fairly treated at that Indignation Meeting, and, in fact, knew nothing about the proceedings thereat but what he had learned through the medium of the press. There was nothing at all extraordinary in a Bishop's having the patronage of Rectories in his diocese, and such was a common thing in the Episcopal Church of England and Ireland. The Bishop then took up the first resolution passed at the Indignation Meeting. saying that he had no objection to it, but that, from what had taken place at that meeting, he felt still more determined to uphold Dr. Lauder. He would here thank Sir Henry Smith and Mr. Milo for the part they took in the affair. He then passed on to the third resolution, which was exceedingly offensive to him. The Bishop here read the third resolution. He believed that there was a wicked meaning in it that, as Dr. Lauder had been a supporter of the Bishop in his election, therefore he, the Bishop, had placed him in the Rectory of Kingston. He would say that this resolution actually imputed simony, to him, but it looked like it. He had not acted in disregard of the feelings of the congregation of St. George's, and, in fact, with the exception of a gentleman who once told him he thought Dr. Lauder a bad reader, he had never heard a word said against Dr. Lauder. Speaking of the other resolution, he denied that he ever said he would appoint Dr. Lauder to the Rectory in defiance of the Congregation, but the power of appointing whom he pleased had been invested in his hands by the Synod, and therefore thought he had the right to enjoy it. He would, in speaking of what Mr. Ross had said, assure the meeting that if the congregation had apprised him at the proper time and place, he might have given more consideration. Dr. Lauder had never yet said anything which showed he wished preferment; but he, the Bishop, had appointed Dr. Lauder because he thought he would be a man fitted for the position he now held.

The last speech he would refer to, was that of Dr. Yates, wherein it was hinted that he, the Bishop, had treated the congregation with contempt; but he assured them that he could not treat them with contempt. Furthermore, he, as the Bishop of the Diocese, could never be intimated; he would assure Dr. Yates of this. They should, before calling a public meeting, and admitting reporters, have had a private conference with him (the Bishop). With regard to the induction of Dr. Lauder, there was nothing whatever wonderful in its having been privately done, inasmuch as it only occupied a few minutes' time. As far as regarded Dr. Lauder's going or staying, he would mention that he (Dr. Lauder) had placed the matter entirely in his own hands. He thought that now was the time for him to stand by Dr. Lauder; for although a Bishop might be responsible to the laity, he was also responsible to his clergy. If there could be a single charge made against the moral character of Dr. Lauder, or if any really good reasons could be adduced for the step, then Dr. Lauder should be deprived of his rectory. He would

now finally say that he actually held in his hands the resignation of Dr. Lauder, conditionally, that the grounds for his dismissal, mentioned at the Indignation Meeting, should be set aside. He (the Bishop) was ready, therefore, to have an open and clear enquiry into the matter, which he was willing to at once inagurate.

As the Bishop had expressed his desire to have no reporters no full report of the above could be obtained, the foregoing being only from memory. Suffice to say that his Lordship produced the reverse of a beneficial effect, and that a formal vestry meeting was summoned for Friday the 25th with the avowed intention of placing the above four resolutions on the vestry books. This the Bishop was most anxious to avoid, and finding threats useless, convened a meeting of the lay delegates of the other churches in Kingston, in which, according to their joint statement to be given hereafter, he promised virtually that he would accept Dr. Lauder's resignation which he said he held, if they could induce St. George's congregation to absolve himself and Dr. Lauder from the charge of simony.

On this understanding the above gentleman canvassed the various members of the vestry with such success that they finally prevailed on them to pass the subjoined resolution. Several persons who had taken part in the meeting of the 19th ult., having first withdrawn on the express and declared ground that they would not under the circumstances interpose between the Bishop and the congregation.

"*Resolved*,—That this vestry meeting cannot but regret that resolutions passed at a meeting of St. George's congregation, held at their Sunday School house, on the 19th instant, have been construed to imply that a simoniacal contract had been made between the Lord Bishop of Ontario and the Rev. Dr. Lauder, relative to the rectory of St. George, Kingston.

"That this meeting disavow any intention of conveying such an impression to the public by such resolutions, and exonerate his Lordship and Dr. Lauder from any such charge affecting their characters. Yet this Vestry would nevertheless respectfully request his Lordship to accept the resignation of Dr. Lauder as Rector, inasmuch as the late unhappy misunderstanding must necessarily have engendered feelings which would, to a great extent, impair his usefulness amongst us."

With this resolution a Deputation waited on his Lordship, to request his acceptance of Dr. Lauder's resignation, nothing doubting but that everything was now arranged, when, to their extreme astonishment, they were told that although his Lordship was much obliged to the Vestry for their conduct in passing it, he could not think of accepting Dr. Lauder's resignation, unless they could substantiate charges against his moral character.

On receipt of the above intelligence, a new meeting was summoned for Monday, December 1st, at which evidence in support of the following resolution was laid before them.

SPEECH OF R. J. CARTWRIGHT, ESQ.,

Made before the Vestry of St. George's Church, on Monday, the 1st December, 1862, in support of the following Resolution, moved by Dr. T. W. Robison.

"*Resolved*, That the congregation of St. George's Church, has learned with great regret, that the Lord Bishop of Ontario has appointed the Ven. Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston, without reference to, and in disregard of the well known wishes of the congregation; and from the many painful rumours which have connected Dr. Lauder's name with the election of the Lord Bishop and with this Rectory, that, without asserting or insinuating that the rumours had foundation in fact it is in the opinion of this congregation highly detrimental to the best interests of the congregation, and of the Church, that the appointment should have been made, or having been made, that it should be maintained."

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:—

Before I proceed to discuss the resolution which I have the honor to support, I wish to say that the reason why the vestry meeting was summoned for so late a day as Friday last, was specially to give you an opportunity for recovering from your first natural outburst of indignation, and in order that you might vote calmly and conscientiously as the facts and your conscience directed you. This, I know, is the earnest wish of my esteemed friends, Mr. Ross and Dr. Robinson, as well as my own, and, I may also add, that in my judgment you would not be justified in passing this resolution without some other and further grounds than those which I think fully warranted your conduct in passing it at the indignation meeting of Wednesday, the 19th ult.

And, Gentlemen, I fear I must yet further tax your patience while I recapitulate the leading facts of the case. You all know that His Lordship is a very young Bishop,—that he is of no very long standing as a clergyman even,—you know also that he was elected by a very small clerical majority after an unusually long and protracted canvass up to the last moment of which every single clerical vote was of great importance to him. You know, too, that he was mainly elected by lay influence, and that that influence was especially exerted on his behalf, because it was supposed that he was a much better Protestant than his opponent, Dr. Bethune. And I do say, that under these circumstances, Dr. Lewis was bound to pay all reasonable difference to the wishes of the laity, and not be in too great a hurry to kick down the ladder by which he has mounted to his present elevation. You are aware, also, that Dr. Lewis, at the Synod lately held at Ottawa, succeeded, after a pretty warm contest with the laity, and after what I consider a very peculiar use of his power of veto, in obtaining the right of presentation to all the rectories in this diocese, on the honorable understanding, however, that he would not use that power to make any appointment distasteful to the wishes of a congregation. And it is to be noted that Dr. Lewis was bound to be specially careful whom he appointed to the Rectory of Kingston, if for no other reason than for this, that I am informed every parish in and about Kingston voted dead against him on this question, thereby conveying a tolerably distinct caution that he ought to be careful how he excercised his patronage here. Now, what does Dr. Lewis do after having obtained the right of presentation under these very peculiar circumstances? Why, the very moment he gets it into his hands he goes and appoints a clergyman to this Rectory, whom he must have known to be distasteful to the great majority of the congregation,—a clergyman whose name has been long associated with his own and with this Rectory by a peculiarly scandalous rumour; and he does all this so quietly and expeditiously that not one soul in Kingston, so far as I am aware, heard that the appointment was likely to be made, till the man was actually appointed, and within a few hours of his induction! ! !

Then, when the uproar, which was the natural and inevitable result of these proceedings took place, Dr. Lewis turns round on us with a charming air of injured innocence, and tells us that if we had waited on him meekly, cap in hand,

with bated breath and whispered humbleness, he might graciously have condescended to take our case, into consideration, and perhaps have advised Dr. Lauder to resign!

Well, Gentlemen, so we would, so we would, if Dr. Lewis would have given us a chance, but we hadn't even an hour; and, I am bound to say, that if we had, the tone and manner which his Lordship saw fit to use to the last deputation from the congregation, which waited on him on a similar subject, was not such as to tempt any honourable man to address him again. And I must say further that I am informed by some members of that deputation that their recollection of what then occurred does dot correspond with his Lordship's statement made here on Monday last. This, at least, I must add, that his Lordship ought to have been the very last man in this city to have said one word about any lack of courtesy or of straightforwardness on our part. If there was any lack of courtesy or of straightforwardness, it was *not* on the part of the congregation of St. George.

Finally, Gentlemen, before I quit this part of my subject, I have one question to ask Dr. Lewis. Why did he appoint Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston? He gave you the answer himself in his speech in this very place on Monday. He told you that he knew that Dr. Lauder was not a burning or a shining light, (I use his own words), but that he appointed him because he was a very convenient and useful man to him (Dr. Lewis); in plain English, because Dr. Lauder was his convenient creature and complete tool. Now, I can understand this being a reason under other and widely-different circumstances for Dr. Lewis' own self: but I do emphatically declare, that it was no kind of reason why the congregation of St. George should be forced to accept a man they detest, because it suited Dr. Lewis' convenience; nor do I consider it to be at all a sufficient and honourable ground for Dr. Lewis' promoting Dr. Lauder to be the second man in his diocese, that he thought he would prove a convenient tool.

And now, Gentlemen, with respect to the resolution itself, I may observe that it contains three distinct assertions, or implications, call them which you will. First, it states that Dr. Lewis appointed Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston, well knowing that such appointment would be distasteful to the congregation. Secondly, that a certain wide-spread public rumour coupling his name and Dr. Lauder's with the election to the Bishopric, and with this Rectory, did exist. Thirdly, that under these circumstanees Dr. Lauder's appointment was, and is, highly detrimental to the best interests of the Church and of this congreation.

Now, Gentlemen, you will please observe that proof of these three assertions is all that you require to justify you in passing this resolution; and proof of these is all that Mr. Ross or I have ever pledged ourselves to give. Mind, I do not say that I have nothing more to urge on other matters; but I do say that we only stand pledged to give proof of these three things, and that proof I shall now proceed to lay before you. And with reference to the statement, that Dr. Lewis appointed Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of Kingston, well knowing that such appointment would be distasteful to the congregation, I shall have once more to beg your patience while I recall to your recollection the fact that some months ago, at the time of the departure of the Rev. Alexander Stewart, it was currently reported, chiefly, I believe, from some expressions dropped by the Bishop himself that Dr. Lauder was to come here as an Assistent Minister; and you will also remember that there was then a pretty general and audible outburst of discontent. Well, from whatever cause, Dr. Lauder did not come here, but was sent to Brockville, and we fondly imagined we had done with him for ever. Now, I do not say positively that our discontent was the reason, although I can myself answer for its being tolerably loud spoken, and although it would be a very fair inference that his Lordship, who was living in Kingston at the time, and in constant communication with many members of the congregation, must have known of this discontent; but this I do say, that if his Lordship did not hear of it, then I am certain he was the only man at all closely connected with this congregation who did not. Nevertheless, I will not rest my case on proofs like these. And first, I beg to inform you that his Lordship himself, within these few days, stated to Dr. Robison, in presence of the Rev. Mr. Denroche, that he would not have ap-

pointed Dr. Lauder if he had known he was distasteful to the congregation, but that with the exception of Mr. Simpson, no man had ever told him so. And I call on Dr. Robison to rise and correct me if I have made any misstatement. (Here Dr. Robison rose and confirmed Mr. C.'s statement.) and, secondly, I beg to say that Mr. S. Taylor, who is also present, informed me in presence of Mr. Ross and Dr. Robison, that he, several months since, deliberately went out to Alwington for the express purpose of warning his Lordship that the appointment of Dr. Lauder, in any shape, would be most distasteful to the congregation. And I call on Mr. Samuel Taylor to rise and correct me if I have made any misstatement. (Here Mr. Samuel Taylor rose and confirmed Mr. C.'s statement.*

And with respect to his Lordship's pledge given publicly in his Synod at Ottawa to the effect that he would not use his power to appoint any one distasteful to a congaegation, I beg to say that there is some difference as to the exact words used by his Lordship. I was informed by Sheriff Corbett, in presence of Dr. Robison, that his Lordship said that he would not appoint any one distasteful. Mr. J. Shannon, who was also present, thought the words were, that he would not appoint any one whom he knew to be distasteful. Mr. A. O'Loughlin, I am informed, stated that his Lordship said that it would be very extraordinary if he appointed any one who would be distasteful. Other gentlemen confirm the statement of Sheriff Corbott. But, at all events. all these witnesses are agreed in two main points, that his Lordship pledged himself in substance not to make any appointment distasteful to a congregation, and that he gave this pledge before he got the power into his hands at all. (Here an interruption, Mr. Simpson stating that the pledge was made after.) Mr. C. resumed. This may be; I only repeat these gentlemen's statements, not having been personally present, but from the different wording of their statements it occurs to me that the pledge may have been repeated more than once, before as well as after. And now, my friends, I have to ask you one question. Setting aside for the moment any evidence we have that his Lordship knew that Dr. Lauder's appointment would be distasteful to the congregation of St. George, I ask you what would you consider to be the honourable fulfilment of an honourable pledge, given on an occasion like this? Do you consider that his Lordship has a right to demand that he should be deemed to have fulfilled his pledge in every case where the congregation fail to furnish legal proof that he knew the appointment would be distasteful? Or do you think that he was bound in all honour to take all reasonable and ordinary precautions to ascertain that the man of his choice would not be distasteful? Now, so far as I am aware, neither his Lordship nor his Lordship's friends have ever dared to assert that he took the smallest or slightest pains to ascertain whether Dr. Lauder's appointment would be popular or not—that he so much as mentioned his intention to a single member of this congregation. Now, do you call this the honourable fulfillment of an honourable pledge? I certainly do not; and I can liken his Lordship's conduct in this matter to nothing but the conduct of a merchant, who, when he suspects his affairs are embarrassed, deliberately abstains from taking stock, or balancing his books, or taking any other ordinary or reasonable precautions for ascertaining his true position, in order that when he finally appears before the Bankruptcy commissioners he may be able to swear with a clear conscience that he really did not know that he was insolvent. And in this connection I must observe, that not a few gentlemen here present who had occasion to notice his Lordship's manner on the Monday and Tuesday preceding our Indignation Meeting, told me then and since that he certainly did not look like a man conscious of having done nothing to mar his welcome back by his people, but rather like one who knew he had done a very disagreeable thing, and who was literally shaking with apprehension at the probable results. And as the question of the accuracy of his Lordship's recollections has come up, I must say plainly that several persons who heard his Lordship's written statement made here on Monday last, wherein he stated not a few things on his own sole authority, have informed me that their impressions differed widely from his on more matters than the

* It afterwards turned out that the parties implicated were Dr. Lauder and the Rev. Mr. Baker.

account of the reception of the deputation before adverted to, and I may also be permitted to instance the well-known fact of his present controversy with the Venerable Archdeacon Brough, whom his Lordship, in his recent well-known letter to the Bishop of Huron—(Here the speaker was interrupted and called to order, and this subject dropped.) * * * * * And now, gentlemen, I shall pass on to the second assertion contained in my resolution, viz.,—That this public scandal touching Dr. Lauder being intended to receive the Rectory of Kingston for his services to Dr. Lewis, did exist, and was of long standing and wide-spread. Now, on all these points, I can give you my own testimony and that of Messrs. Ross and Robison, and I believe that of Dr. Yates, Mr. Askew, and many others here present, to the effect that we had heard it many times, and from many different persons; and I also happen to have in my hand a copy of the *Watchman*, published at Toronto, in which the editor avers that to his own personal knowledge and that of others in Toronto, the report to which I have alluded was currently circulated, even there, long before Dr. Lewis' election. And I must say, if, under these circumstances—and I can easily supplement them with a hundred more—I was not warranted in speaking of this rumour as a public scandal in my speech of the 19th ult., then there is no such thing as a public scandal in *rerum naturâ*. As to the other point which some persons may say is implied here, namely, that Dr. Lauder's conduct during the canvass was so objectionable as to furnish some grounds, at least, for the general currency of the report adverted to, I have to say that the same persons who were aware of the rumour were aware also of the fact that he worked most indefatigably and zealously to secure Dr. Lewis' election; but, I must add, though his friends admit this, they contend that he only did what he had a perfect right to do, and that he did not outstep the limits of strict clerical partizanship.

Gentlemen, I hope my reverend friends here present will not be offended if I say that I do not know what these limits may be, but that I am informed by Dr. Robison that he distinctly recollects Dr. Lauder's having on one occasion, at a meeting held in this vestry room, pledged himself not to canvass any more—that pledge being drawn from him, as I understood, by some remarks which his special zeal had produced. And I am also informed by the same gentleman, that the Rev. Mr. Bower of this neighbourhood, stated to him more than once, that Dr. Lauder had subsequently canvassed him. Furthermore, gentlemen—and I make this statement not, so far as I know, as affecting Dr. Lauder, but simply to show you that the scandalous disregard of truth and honour on the part of some of our clery, has reached a pitch, which, unless instantly and sternly checked, must make our church a very scorn and derision among all honourble men—furthermore, I say, I have here a letter recently received from Judge Malloch of Perth, which I will here read. [Reads letter.] Sharp practice this, gentlemen, very sharp practice; and although I do not as yet know what ornament of our church has been improving her reputation after this fashion, I take leave to say that it imperatively behoves you and all really sincere members of the Church of England to stop such acts at any cost. I should explain that the church notes here referred to were given, I believe, for the Ontario Episcopal Endowment Fund. And with this I quit the second portion of my resolution. As regards the third statement, that this appointment has been, and is highly detrimental to the best interests of the church and of the congregation, I think there can hardly be two opinions. Or must I recall to your minds the universal and all but unprecedented outburst of indignation with which the news was received, the unanimous condemnation accorded to it by the provincial press, with scarcely one solitary exception, or the lamentable consequences which have followed, and I fear will continue to follow it?

Gentlemen, I do not believe a man could be found in the whole diocese to stand up and say that this appointment was not detrimental. For the rest, I beg you to observe that I have strictly followed the injunction with respect to the Bishop that everything should be substantiated out of the mouth of two or three witnesses. On my sole authority I have said nothing. It is due to myself to say that I believe every word I have said to be true, but that if I can be

proved to have wronged him, I am prepared to bear any punishment which can be inflicted, first, and to make the humblest apologies thereafter. And now, gentlemen, once more and for the last time I ask, do you or do you not, on your honour and consciences, believe that this appointment was and is highly detrimental to the best interests of our church and our congregation ?

FROM JUDGE MALLOCH TO C. S. ROSS.

[COPY.]

PERTH, Nov. 28th, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR,—With regard to the Church notes, various defences have been set up. I have had the most trouble at the village of Renfrew, where several gentlemen swore that the notes were given on the express conditions that the Bishop would reside at Ottawa, and that a resident clergyman would be settled at Renfrew within three months. Neither of these conditions were complied with. But as they were not embodied in the notes, and the notes were transferred to the plaintiff for value, before they became due, and without notice, the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The impression is that the notes were transferred to O'Donnell, merely to prevent the parties setting up this defence, and consequently, a very strong feeling exists with regard to some of these suits; and I have no doubt it will be at considerable sacrifice in such a season as this that some of the parties will be able to satisfy the judgments obtained against them.

I am, my dear sir,

Yours respectfully,

C. S. Ross, Esq., Kingston. J. G. MALLOCH.

But as Sheriff Corbett and the other gentlemen who had waited on the Bishop did not appear, and as the meeting was disposed to hope against hope that the Bishop could not be in earnest in refusing to accept Dr. Lauder's resignation, it was finally moved in amendment and agreed by all parties, as follows:

That in view of the action taken by this Vestry at its last meeting, it is inexpedient at the present to discuss further in Vestry the differences which have arisen in relation to the appointment of Dr. Lauder to the Rectory of St. George. And this Vestry would respectfully solicit that, in the event of no charges being preferred against Dr. Lauder, within two weeks from his Lordship's reception of this Resolution, that his Lordship do then give an answer to the Deputation from the Vestry Meeting of Friday last.

Meantime, fuller details of the Bishop's interview with the lay delegates formerly referred to having become known, a good deal of indignation was excited, which was not allayed by the publication of the accompanying letters from the Dean and Bishop.

BROCKVILLE, Dec. 5, 1862.

MY LORD—After having duly weighed and considered all that has occurred with regard to the Kingston Rectory question, I feel that the speeches of several gentlemen at the meetings have been so offensive, that I am obliged now to withdraw the resignation which I placed conditionally in your Lordship's hands.

When I did so, I knew that a great principle was involved in the question, and I felt much reluctance in giving way, and thus embarrassing your Lordship; but believing that I was unacceptable to the congregation who worship in the Rectory Church, on the ground of simple unpopularity, I thought

it better (perhaps wrongly) to wave that principle and withdraw. The Rectory of Kingston belongs to the Diocese at large, and not to the congregation of St. George in particular; and when your Lordship was pleased to give it to me without any seeking on my part, I never anticipated the opposition which has arisen, and I should now have gladly shrunk from it if I had been allowed; but I feel that, having resigned freely and voluntarily in consequence of the spirit exhibited at the first meeting, I have been so aspersed that it is due to myself now to hold my position, which I am glad under the circumstances to think the laws of the Church and the country enables me to do.

I have the honor to remain,
Your Lordship's obedient servant,
W. B. Lauder.

Alwington House, Dec. 6, 1862.

My Dear Dean—I am in receipt of yours of the 5th inst., in which you withdraw your resignation of the Rectory of Kingston. On a review of the whole case, I think you have come to a wise decision, for although I should not have felt it to be my duty to urge your retention of the Rectory, yet I cannot but think that your withdrawal would have been attended with compromise of your character and a loss of your own self-respect. You have, however, relieved me from any necessity of advising you by your spontaneous determination to hold the position to which I appointed you. But I must now make some remarks on this unhappy agitation. When your appointment became known, a very fierce indignation meeting was held by the Parishioners of St. George's Church. Resolutions were passed (if they meant anything) meant that the Rectory was given to you as a stipulated reward for your zeal in my behalf before my election to the Episcopate. As there must be of necessity two parties to a contract, not only were you accused of improper conduct, but the Bishop of the Diocese was held up to the scorn of the whole Province, as guilty of the detestible sin of simony. The most charitable construction I was able to put on their resolutions, was to suppose that the framer of them had little idea of the heiniousness of the crime with which he charged his spiritual pastors, or that because craft and cunning in gaining wealth and office are so naturally used in the present day, there is no harm in their judging of the clergy by the prevalent standard. It is true that the Vestry has disavowed any offensive meaning in their resolution, and saved their decency at the expense of their understanding; and since I accepted their disavowal as an apology, I would never in any public way have again alluded to their proceedings, but that the whole matter was re-opened in the Vestry meeting held on December 1st, when a large audience listened to Mr. Cartwright, endeavouring to fasten charges on myself, without apparent disgust at his unmanliness, or reminding him that a Vestry is not a tribunal competent to entertain charges against a Bishop of the Church.

It is urged that I paid no deference to the feelings of the congregation in appointing a Rector whom I knew to be unpopular. Now, had the congregation met in private and passed resolutions expressive of your unpopularity, and sent those resolutions to me by a deputation in the first instance, thus fulfilling the injunction, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone," I know that you would instantly have resigned, and the whole subsequent scandal would have been avoided. To excuse themselves from adopting this course, it is said that I was well aware of your unpopularity. This I solemnly deny. I had no reason to believe that you were unpopular in any such sense as to make it

manifest that your usefulness would be destroyed. No one of those present at the "indignation" meeting had even told me of your unpopularity, except one gentleman, who, in an interview with him, left on my mind the impression that you were unpopular with himself, but not of necessity with the majority of the congregation. Perhaps the cause of their silence was a feeling of shame, which kept them back from expressing a dislike for which they could give no rational account; for even to this moment I am unable to find an individual who can assign a cause for his opposition. It is an old proverb that "we do not readily forgive those whom we have injured;" accordingly, after the first injustice done at the indignation meeting, every method was used to intensify the feeling against you. The mode of proceeding was diabolical. "Rumours" were circulated to your detriment, and then their existence was pleaded as justification for denouncing you as unworthy of being Rector of Kingston. The crafty ringleader of this unmanly game informs the meeting of the existence of "disgusting" rumours. Of course, he disbelieves them, he says; yet he is not above alluding to them. So astonishing was the effrontery of your assailants, that your friends were staggered.

A friend of yours wrote to me to say, that "They must certainly have something more serious than what has been put before the public, or they would not appear so firm." And though I never wavered in my belief in your entire integrity, yet I was not wholly free from uneasiness till I heard from the Rev. Mr. Bartlett that when the Rev. Mr. Denroche demanded from Mr. Cartwright what his accusations against you were, he replied that "he would not show his hand," and until I heard from the Rev. Mr. Denroche that the same person said "he would white-wash you to any extent if you would only resign." Then I perceived the true position of affairs. Intimidation was to effect what reason and evidence could not be employed to accomplish. "Resign or we shall ruin you," was the alternative held out—a menace more odious in the sight of God and man, than the threatening letters of the ignorant but determined assassin, who imagines that he has wrongs to avenge.

I have openly in public meeting expressed my anxious wish to bring all these "rumours" or charges before a competent tribunal. I challenge scrutiny on your behalf; but now I am met with the reply, "We have made no charges," though I possess a letter signed by Messrs. Cartwright, Ross and Robison, in which they say, "After the speech of his Lordship of yesterday, we must accept the challenge; and the consequence will be, that we must impugn both Bishop and Dean." And they go on to object to the constitution of the Bishop's Court, on the ground that I preside therein, an objection easily got rid of by abstaining from acting as President for the occasion.

I am anxious for the investigation on my own account likewise, because there seems a tendency to shift the indignation and the "charges" from you to myself; and the executor of the late Dean has so far forgot his position as to examine the correspondence of the deceased for evidence whereby to fasten on me the charge of falsehood. This imputation I desire may be enquired into, of the whole correspondence published, as Mr. Cartwright has in a public meeting made use of it. For this and the additional reason that some explanation may be given for Mr. Cartwright's vindictiveness, whereby the possibility of his not being wholly influenced by chagrin can be established, I reiterate my readiness to issue a commission to sift these damaging charges by evidence to be given on oath. I shall not dwell upon the many other methods made use of to intensify the feeling of the congregation against you—such as that the Rev. Mr. Loosemore would not serve

under you, and that St. George's congregation ought to have an English, not an Irish rector—but conclude with some remarks on the attempt now being made to bring what is called public opinion to bear on this controversy. Under our present mode of Church government, I exercise my power as Bishop in a constitutional manner. Hence I am responsible to the public opinion of the Church. But that public opinion which originates in "rumours," and finds expression in newspapers, I utterly ignore. In the language of an eminent Irish prelate, whose spirit I admire and adopt, "I would sooner tear the lawn from my shoulders, and sink my seal deeper than ever plummet sounded, than hold rank and emolument on the disgraceful tenure of never opposing public opinion."

In what I have thus addressed to you, I do not wish to be understood as implicating the whole congregation of St. George's in this disgraceful agitation. There is a large and respectable minority of persons who view with disapprobation the conduct of a majority who are guilty of the very tyranny they would denounce in their Bishop.

Commending you to Him "who helpeth them to right who suffer wrong,"

I am, my dear Dean, yours faithfully,

J. T. Ontario.

The Very Rev. the Dean of Ontario.

TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

My Lord,—I am sorry that you have stated in your letter of December 6th, addressed to the Dean of Ontario, that "the executor of the late Dean had so far forgot his position as to examine the correspondence of the deceased for evidence, whereby to fasten on me the charge of falsehood." This statement is unworthy of a Bishop, who had been assured by the executor in question that all the correspondence of your Lordship with the late Dean, that had come into his possession, had, at the very outset of this unhappy controversy, been burned by him; and that, while in his keeping, no person had seen or perused it. This statement was made also to two of your clerical friends. My character for honesty of purpose and straightforward dealing is, I trust, too firmly established in this community to be lightly shaken, even by the allegation of a Bishop. It has not hitherto been doubted; and I am not going, at my time of life, to falsify all my previous conduct, even for the purpose of removing an obnoxious rector, or of proving a Bishop untruthful.

The letter of the late Dean of Ontario, to which your Lordship alludes in your letter to Dr. Lauder, was not hunted up by me, among the correspondence of the late Dean, as your Lordship rashly asserts, but was given to me months ago. I read it, showed it to three friends, and returned it. Since then I have not seen it or sought for it.

I am your obedient servant,

Thomas W. Robison.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BRITISH WHIG.

Sir,—In to-day's *News* appears a long letter from the Bishop of Ontario, commenting pretty warmly on my conduct.

As my speech of December 1st is, I hope, by this time in circulation, I direct his Lordship's attention thereto. He will find in it facts, proofs and authorities, which he will do well to explain.

I presume no one who heard that speech, will expect me to pay much regard to any aspersions thrown out against me by his Lordship, and rest

ing on his own personal word alone—except, indeed, to contradict them emphatically, which I do now, once for all.

If his Lordship has anything to advance against me, he is probably aware that I am not likely to decline answering him, so soon as distinct particulars are given. The public must decide between us, and I have not much fear of the result—particularly if his Lordship will continue to write letters.

I am your obedient servant,

Kingston, Dec. 8, 1862. R. J. Cartwright.

The publication of Mr. Cartwright's pamphlet was answered by the Bishop, through the medium of the Synod Chaplain, Mr. Bartlett, in the following letter.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BRITISH WHIG.

Sir,—The Lord Bishop of Ontario has read Mr. Cartwright's published version of his speech, made in support of a resolution, afterwards unanimously abandoned, at the vestry meeting of 1st December instant.

The tone and temper of that speech is so offensive, that his Lordship does not feel called on to reply to it himself; but he has directed me, as his Secretary, to make some remarks thereon; and he has furnished me with some materials for the purpose.

Mr. Cartwright, who is not a member of our Synod, speaks of a "very peculiar use of his Lordship's power of veto," as having been made by him at Ottawa. Now, the Bishop made no use of his power of veto, and never had occasion to use it. He did not, in fact, speak on the patronage question, till the debate had closed, and the question was about to be put. He then plainly told the Synod that they could not compel him to accept the patronage; that they could retain it themselves; but if they gave it to him, they must give it untrammelled with any conditions whatsoever. This information was given to the Synod by his Lordship, as an act of courtesy, to save them the possible trouble of giving a useless vote. The amendment proposed by Mr. Chancellor Henderson, gave occasion to the Bishop for stating that he would not consult lay delegates, nor churchwardens, nor any other persons, about the appointment of a Rector; but that he would not knowingly appoint a Rector who was decidedly disliked by the people.

I now come to the following extract from Mr. Cartwright's speech, as printed.

"He (the Bishop) told you that he knew that Dr. Lauder was not a burning or a shining light (I use his own words), but that he appointed him because he was a very convenient and useful man to him (Dr. Lewis); in plain English, because Dr. Lauder was his convenient creature and complete tool."

Now, sir, if Mr. Cartwright heard the Bishop deliver his explanation to the meeting on Monday, November 24th, he cannot but know that he has misrepresented his Lordship here. I will give my own recollection of what the Bishop said, which his Lordship himself considers accurate. I may here remark that the speech of the Bishop was not a "written statement," as Mr. Cartwright says it was.

"Dr. Lauder," said the Bishop, "may not be a burning and a shining light in the pulpit, but he is a good and useful parish priest, a man of standing in the diocese, a Doctor of Laws of a celebrated university; he is a good man of business, and, from my own intimate personal knowledge of him, I feel that he will co-operate well with me, and help me to carry out my principles and views in the Cathedral Church and parish."

Next, I must enquire for what possible reason, other than to make mischief, is the dismissal of the Rev. A. Stewart from St. George's, dragged into this affair of the appointment of Dr. Lauder to the Rectory?

The history of Mr. Stewart's dismissal is this: after the election to the Bishoprick, Archdeacon Stewart told the Bishop elect that he was about to dismiss Mr. Stewart at once. Dr. Lewis entreated him not to do so, and, at his urgent request, he consented to retain him; and nothing further passed between the Archdeacon and the Bishop elect on the subject, till November 22, 1861, when the following letter reached the Bishop elect, at Brockville:

Kingston, Nov. 22, 1861.

Right Reverend Sir,—It is my intention, immediately after your approaching consecration, to dismiss the Rev. Mr. Stewart from the charge and cure of the St. George's congregation, and to relieve him from the office of Assistant Minister. By this step you will be requested and required to supply the vacancy by the appointment of a successor to the vacant office, to be obtained from the United Empire, or from one of the Provincial dioceses, or from within the Archdeaconry of Kingston. I am compelled, by reason of the extraordinary conduct and bearing of Mr. Stewart, to have recourse to his dismissal. Upon adopting this resolution, I had entertained the idea of retaining his services three months beyond the period of your approaching consecration, but upon mature reflection, I abandoned the intention, convinced in my mind that Mr. Stewart would avail himself of the delay to create a party in the congregation of St. George's favourable to his retention in office, and on the plea and argument that he derived his appointment of Assistant Minister which emanated from the Bishop of Toronto, and not from the Rector, and to become my successor on the vacancy.

I should be glad to have your opinion on this course I intend to pursue, and which I think will secure peace and harmony to St. George's.

I am, Right Reverend Sir,
Your faithful and obedient servant and brother,
George O'Kill Stuart.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop Elect of Ontario.

This letter is printed here from the original MS. of Dr. Stuart. It is marked "private," and would not have been published but for the letter from the Rev. A. Stuart, which appeared in the *Whig* of last night.

It was not long after the date of this letter from Dr. G. O. Stuart, when Dr. Lewis, being in Kingston, called on the Archdeacon, found him very angry, enquired the cause, and learned that he considered that Mr. A. Stewart had insulted him, and had the nature of the insult described to him. The Archdeacon then showed Dr. Lewis a letter which he had written to Mr. Stewart, dismissing him in very offensive terms. The Bishop Elect remonstrated and the Archdeacon, in his presence, made two several attempts at a suitable letter on the subject. He liked neither of these, so he at last asked Dr. Lewis to assist him, which he did according, by interlining or expunging or doing both. The Bishop Elect mentioned these circumstances on the same day to several persons, to Mr. W. B. Simpson for one.

All these facts are perfectly compatible with another fact, that is, that Dr. Lewis did not impel the Archdeacon to dismiss Mr. Stewart, against whom, indeed, Dr. G. O. Stuart was so incensed that the Bishop Elect could not have prevailed upon the Archdeacon to retain him. The assumption of Mr. Cartwright that the Bishop was taxed by the Venerable Archdeacon Patton with procuring the dismissal of the Rev. A. Stewart, is a very cool piece of impertinence on his (Mr. Cartwright's) part.

Archdeacon Patton never presumed to tax his Lordship with anything, as appears by his own letters published at the end of Mr. Cartwright's pamphlet.

I come lastly to that very contemptible insinuation about "church notes," which Mr. Cartwright makes. What is that to us—to Dr. Lauder —to the Bishop? Who has broken any promises in connexion with these notes? Who had any power to make such promises? No doubt many persons desired that Ottawa should be the cathedral city. It may be that the church people of Ottawa will again give utterance to such a wish, and beg their Bishop to leave a parish where he has been insulted and maligned, and to come to them, who have always honoured, trusted, and loved him!

I am, Sir, your faithful servant,

T. H. M. Bartlett,

Chaplain and Secretary to the Lord Bishop of Ontario, and Clerical Secretary of the Synod of Ontario.

Kingston, December 10, 1862.

To which Mr. Cartwright replied, by proposing to refer the whole matter to the decision of the other Canadian Bishops.

THE CHURCH DIFFICULTIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

Sir,—I was agreeably surprised at the general tone of Dr. Lauder's letter which appeared in your issue of to-day, and I am bound to add that, strongly as I disapprove of his appointment, I think Dr. Lauder has acted with considerable judgment and good sense throughout (save only in withdrawing his resignation).

Dr. Lauder, to do him justice, writes like a man fully conscious of the gravity of the case, and as he and the Bishop (*vide* his Lordship's letter of December 6th) have now both publicly expressed their anxiety to have an investigation of the various statements affecting their character, I take the liberty of offering a suggestion to them and to the Churchmen of this diocese generally.

It is perfectly clear that no tribunal can be found in the Diocese of Ontario fitted to decide on questions affecting the reputation of its two highest dignitaries; and it is at least equally clear that, considering the lengths to which this thing has gone, nothing short of a formal investigation, by a thoroughly competent and impartial court, can ever sift the matter thoroughly.

The only body I know of capable of doing this is a court composed of the remaining Canadian Bishops, presided over by the Metropolitan, and assisted by the Chancellors of the other dioceses and colleges; and before them, if needful, I am willing to appear at any reasonable sacrifice of time or money, provided always the Bishop of Ontario will pledge himself to abide by their decision.

I do not ask for publicity, and I think I am justified in saying that, while every Churchman in Canada would attach the extremest weight to the verdict of such a body, it is at the same time one which from its very constitution would be certain to show his Lordship every reasonable indulgence.

It rests with his Lordship, however, to demand that this court be held, nor is there much room to doubt that, where interests of such magnitude are at stake, it would be granted him at once.

I remain, your obedient servant,

R. J. Cartwright.

Kingston, December 23rd, 1862.

This proposal was not accepted, and, on the 6th January, 1863, Sheriff Corbett published a statement of the interview between the Bishop and the Lay Delegates, the substance of which had already appeared in the press.

THE BISHOP'S PRIVATE MEETING.—STATEMENT OF THE LAY DELEGATES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

SIR,—Owing to what has appeared in the papers relative to the meeting of Lay Delegates of St. Paul's and St. James, which took place on the 26th of November, at the residence of Mr. Wm. Shannon, I consider it my duty to lay before the public the circumstances which took place upon that occasion. The meeting was called at the Bishop's request, and he was accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Denroche. His Lordship opened the proceedings by remarking that he had called the meeting in consequence of an article which had appeared in the *Daily News* that morning, stating that the interests of the congregations of St. Paul and St. James were identical with those of St. George's, and that the laity of those congregations sympathized with that of the latter; which assertions his Lordship denied. His Lordship entered into full explanations with regard to the difficulty at St. George's, stating that if there was any thing at all connected with the matter the Delegates did not understand, or if there was anything they wished explained, he was anxious to explain it. A friendly conversation followed, in the course of which I said, "is there no way, my Lord, by which these unhappy difficulties can be settled?" His Lordship replied, "that he wished to God there was, but he did not know of any so long as the resolution imputing simony to himself and Dr. Lauder remained uncancelled." I replied, supposing that the resolutions were rescinded, would he accept Dr. Lauder's resignation? The Bishop rejoined that "undoubtedly if that resolution were rescinded, it would remove a very great obstacle in the way of an amicable settlement; and although he would make no promises, yet he would meet them half way, and more than half way." It was in the course of this conversation that I observed, "Blessed are the peace makers;" to which his Lordship replied, "As much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men."

I am not aware of anything which passed at that meeting which could justify Mr. Denroche in stating that "nothing said thereat by his Lordship could warrant the presumption that he was disposed to obtain peace by the sacrifice of his friend, or by the compromise of that friend's character in any way, or to the smallest extent whatsover." Who wanted the Bishop to sacrifice his friend or to compromise his character? Certainly no person at that meeting.

His Lordship further stated, that had the congregation of St. George's met him privately, by delegation or otherwise, and expressed that Dr. Lauder was personally unpopular, he would have consulted their feelings. A Delegate asked, "If the Congregation publicly retracted their offensive resolution, would his Lordship treat them the same as if it had not been passed?" To which the Bishop replied, "Yes, yes, we would begin anew." From the whole tenor of his Lordship's conversation at that meeting it was the unanimous opinion of the Delegates present, that if the resolution passed by the Vestry of St. George, which was believed to impute simony to the Bishop and Dr. Lauder, were rescinded, that his Lordship would

accept Dr. Lauder's resignation, which he then held, and that the whole difficulty would be arranged. Acting upon this belief, after his Lordship and Mr. Denroche had retired from the meeting, the Delegates and Churchwardens remained and drew up the resolutions which, slightly modified, was, on the following Friday, at the Vestry of St. George, moved by myself and seconded by his Worship the Mayor, and it passed by a vote of 28 to 9, the former being the opponents, and the latter the Clergy and friends of the Dean. I may add that I succeeded in getting theVestry of St. George's to pass that resolution chiefly on the ground that by its doing so the Bishop would accept Dr. Lauder's resignation, and peace would be restored.

When the committee waited on the Bishop and read to him the resolution that had been passed, he said, "Now peace is restored between St. George's Vestry and their Bishop;" thus acquiescing in the action taken, and confirming the belief that peace had thereby been restored. Yet about a fortnight later the Bishop writes to Dr. Lauder that "the Vestry had disallowed any offensive meaning in their resolution, and *saved their decency at the expense of their understanding.* I will conclude by stating that, as to that portion of Mr. Denroche's letter referring to the fitness or unfitness of Dr. Lauder, not one word was said upon the subject at the meeting. I trust this letter will satisfy the Congregation of St. George that in persuading them to vote for the resolution rescinding their former resolution, I at least did not deceive them.

I an your obedient servant,

THOMAS A. CORBETT, *Sheriff,*
Lay Delegate of St. Paul's.

Kingston, 5th January, 1863.

We do hereby certify that the above statement is correct as far as the same relates to the meeting held at Mr. Shannon's, on the evening of Wednesday, the 26th of November.

JAMES HOPE,
JAMES SHANNON,
Churchwardens and Lay Delegates of St. Paul's.

WARREN P. STREET,
Churchwarden of St. James's.

WM. SHANNON,
Churchwarden and Lay Delegate for St. James's.

T. W. NASH,
Lay Delegate for St. James's.

Kingston, 5th January, 1863.

This statement was confirmed, as has been seen, by five other gentlemen, and was never attempted to be refuted save by a simple reaffirmation of Mr. Denroche's letter of January 2nd, therein alluded to.

THE RECTORY DIFFICULTIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

SIR,—In your leading article of Wednesday you refer to a meeting of the Wardens and Synod Delegates from and of St. Paul's and St. James's Churches, held in Kingston, at which meeting the Lord Bishop of the Diocese was present.

Having accompanied his Lordship, at his own request, I trust you will suffer me to state certain facts and points as I understood them, and more

especially as connected with the "*honourable understanding*" which, you say, "*his Lordship did not act up to.*" The only understanding, if such it may be called, that was arrived at, has been acted up to by the Bishop as far as it was within his own power to act. And this I now proceed to show.

A delegate from St. Paul's, who has a seat in St. George's, expressed himself most anxious for the full restoration of peace in the congregation of the latter with its Bishop, and used the words of our Saviour—"Blessed are the peace makers." His Lordship reminded him of the words of that Saviour's Apostle—"As much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men" —and observed that however highly desirable is the blessing of peace, it should never be purchased by any sacrifice of truth or of principle. Afterwards, when this gentlemnn was endeavouring to draw out from his Lordship some expression that might commit him to the acceptance of Dr. Lauder's conditional resignation of the Rectory of St. George's, one or more of the gentlemen present told him not to corner the Bishop, as his Lordship would do what he thought right.

The Bishop had expressed himself as feeling deeply hurt by the procedure of the St. George's indignation meeting, but agreed that an action on the part of the St. George's Vestry, exculpatiug him from the imputation of simony, would tend materially to the restoration of amicable feeling; and that were such action taken, the ground would be so far cleared for a fresh starting point in reference to the fitness or unfitness of Dr. Lauder for the St. George's Rectory. I listened with much attention to all that passed at that meeting; and I must most distinctly say that nothing said thereat by his Lordship could warrant the presumption that he was disposed to obtain peace by the sacrifice of his friend, or by the compromise of that friend's character, in any way or to the smallest extent whatsoever. Nor, on the other hand, did his Lordship say anything that could lead the meeting to suppose that had Dr. Lauder, after being fully and fairly cleared of every insinuation, imputation, and detrimental rumour, thought proper to ask to be permitted to retire from a post that had been made so unpleasant to him, his Bishop would have resisted his request for a moment.

A brief retrospect of the course of events subsequent to that meeting will plainly show that the charge of "not acting up to an honourable understanding" is wholly undeserved by the Bishop in this matter. At the vestry of St. George's Cathedral, held shortly after this meeting, Mr. J. R. Cartwright, the spokesman of the opposition, thought proper to assert that within a couple of days he himself had heard some "disgusting rumours" about Dr. L., that he himself did not believe them, and that if any had come to that meeting expecting to have their prurient imaginations gratified, they would not be gratified by him. Mr. Cartwright had previously stated in my presence that he would take care not to lay himself open to a crtminal prosecution. *That* vestry was held on *Friday.* At a vestry held on the following Monday, this same person endeavoured to show that Dr. Lauder had actually obtained certain money obligations (promissory notes) upon false pretences. He also tried hard, through the evidence of Dr. R. and Mr. T., to make out the Bishop to have told a falsehood. (I am happy here to be able to state that Mr. T. thanked me afterwards most cordially for having fully explained away in the same vestry Mr. Carwright's imputations against his Lordship.)

These efforts on the part of Cartwright to blacken the character of both Dr. Lauder and his friend and patron, were too much even for so quiet and retiring an individual as the Dean to submit to. He *thereupon withdrew his conditional resignation out of the hands of the Bishop,* and thus boldly

threw down the gauntlet for his assailant to take up, and has, in so doing, challenged him to make good his revilings. *From that moment his Lordship had no power whatever to "act" in the matter at all.* It is for the opponent of the rector of St. George to *take action;* and has had, as I am credibly informed, every information how to procced against Dr. Lauder supplied to him by the Doctor's law agent, Dr. Henderson.

You say that a resolution moved by Mr. Corbett at the *Friday* vestry meeting of St. George's passed without dissent. Here, Sir, you have been misinformed. The Rev. Mr. Bartlett's amendment had nine votes recorded in its favor. The object of that amendment was to assert that Dr. Lauder ought not to be expected to resign the Rectory until he had been proved guilty of one or other of the charges insinuated against him. These nine gentlemen, by the refusal of Mr. Corbett to *divide* his resolution, which embraced two distinct subjects,were actually compelled to withhold a vote, exculpatory of his Lordship, so that they might not do an injury to the Rector of St. George's.

Hoping that you will excuse the unavoidable length of this communication.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient and faithful servant,
E. Denroche.

Kingston, January 2, 1863.

The publication of Sheriff Corbett's statement called forth many severe remarks from the press, of which the following article from the *Globe* may serve as a sample.

SHARP PRACTICE.

Bishop Lewis, in dealing with the St. George's Church difficulty, has displayed a vast deal of cleverness. He has got his nominee duly installed, after having by adroit management procured the rescinding of the resolution which imputed simony to himself and Dr. Lauder. He has thus got the congregation at a disadvantage, there being an apparent unreasonableness in their continuing to remonstrate against Dr. Lauder's appointment, after they have themselves withdrawn the only distinct objection which they had urged against it. He has undoubtedly shown a very considerable amount of smartness in bringing matters into this position, but, as the whole facts come to be known, many will be of the opinion that, while he has in a measure attained the object he had in view, he has done so by having recourse to a style of sharp practice which we should sooner expect to be exhibited by an unscrupulous man of the world than by a Christian Bishop. He has managed the Kingston Rectory business with a slippery adroitness which, if he had any opportunity for displaying his talents in the walks of politics, would be apt to make the most accomplished political tricksters, even John A. Macdonald himself, feel jealous of him. We publish to-day a letter from Sheriff Corbett, of Kingston, giving a plain, unimpassioned narrative of the measures adopted by the Bishop to induce the congregation of St. George's to withdraw the resolution which ascribed to him unworthy motives in appointing Dr. Lauder. Even the unsupported statement of a man like Sheriff Corbett of what took place at the interview with the Bishop, would be entitled to much weight, but, when we find it confirmed as it is in every particular by the other Lay Delegates and Churchwardens who were present, no one will hesitate to give it entire confidence. To what, then, do these gentlemen testify? They say

that the Bishop told them that, if that resalution were rescinded, a very great obstacle in the way of an amicable settlement would be removed, and when he told them this he could not but be aware that the only amicable settlement of the difficulty to which the congregation would listen, was his acceptance of Dr. Lauder's resignation. He told them further that "he would meet them half-way, and more than half-way," although in saying this he cunningly left himself a back door to escape by, in adding that "he would make no promises." The congregation doubtless imagined that, in declining to make promises, while holding out to them the hope that he would meet their views, he desired merely to save his dignity. The result has proved that his Lordship interposed this remark with a very different object. He told them further, that, if the congregation publicly retracted their offensive resolution, he would treat them the same as if it had not passed. Taking this in connection with his statement that, if they had in the first instance met him privately and informed him that Dr. Lauder was personally unpopular, he would have consulted their feelings, they considered they had the Bishop's sacred word for it, as much as if they had had his written pledge under his own hand and seal, that, if they rescinded the resolution, he would accept Dr. Lauder's resignation which was then in his hands. Sheriff Corbett and the other gentlemen reported to the vestry meeting the result of the interview, and the vestry, in the full belief that the resolution in question was the only obstacle in the way of Dr. Lauder's appointment being cancelled, agreed by a vote of 28 to 9 to rescind it. The Bishop had now accomplished his object of putting the congregation in a disadvantageous position, if they continued to object to their Rector. With a heartless sneer at their simplicity, he wrote to Dr. Lauder that they had "saved their decency at the expense of their understanding," and, instead of fulfilling the implied obligation to remove Dr. Lauder, he proceeded to instate him in the Rectorship with all the ceremonies usual on such occasions.

The proceeding certainly redounds little to the Bishop's credit. He made the congregation no promise, he told them. True; they had not thought a promise necessary. They trusted his honour as a gentleman that he would perform what he said, when he intimated to them, in terms as plain as are considered a sufficient warrant for ordinary transactions in every-day life, that, if they withdrew the obnoxious resolution, he would withdraw the obnoxious appointment, and they did not care to insult him by making him sign a distinct contract to that effect. Having made up his mind that Dr. Lauder should be Rector, is there any code of morality which will justify his offering the congregation an amicable settlement, his expressing a willingness to meet them half way, and his telling them, "we will begin anew," in the event of their rescinding their resolution? If he carried his point cleverly, the means he employed were not such as would be resorted to by a Bishop who earnestly strove to preserve his episcopal lawn unsullied, He succeeded in outwitting his congregation, and may have chuckled over their simplicity and his own astuteness, as he assisted in the ceremony of the "reading in" of Dr. Lauder as Rector.

But, after all, he was not clever enough to foresee that, when the whole proceeding came to be exposed, as Sheriff Corbett and his co-delegates have now revealed it, the respect entertained for him in his episcopal character would be infinitely more damaged by such a revelation than it would have suffered from his submitting to have his will thwarted as to who should be Rector of St. George's. For the present the Bishop has got a questionable victory, in having the Rectory filled by his nominee, in opposition to the protest of almost the entire congregation. But the matter cannot remain where it is. Canadians will not submit to be trampled upon in

their ecclesiastical any more than in their civil character, and Bishop Lewis will probably find that, instead of having strengthened his episcopal authority by the course he has taken in the Kingston Rectory case, he has only succeeded in awakening the Churchmen of Canada to the necessity of asserting and vindicating their rights, with a firmness of purpose which the opposition of a whole Bench of Bishops would be unable to resist.

And the inference thence drawn was materially strengthened in the minds of the people of Kingston, at least by the publication of the subjoined letters narrating a conversation between J. A. Henderson the Chancellor of the Diocese of Ontario and Mr. G. LaSere, from which it appears to be put beyond all reasonable doubt that the Bishop was aware of the dislike of the congregation to Dr. Lauder many months before the Rectory fell vacant.

THE RECTORY DIFFICULTIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

Sir,—Shortly after the publication of my speech of December 1st, I learned that Mr. Chancellor Henderson had, prior to Dr. Lauder's appointment, admitted that the Bishop was aware of the dislike of the people of Kingston to Dr. Lauder. Yesterday, being desirous of settling the matter, not only beyond doubt, but beyond question, I called on Mr. LaSerre and stated what I had heard, whereupon that gentleman frankly acknowledged that shortly before Dr. Lauder's induction, Mr. Henderson had called upon him and had stated, in the course of conversation, that Dr. Lauder *could not be appointed*, because the Bishop, at the time of the Rev. Alexander Stewart's final dismissal, had remarked to him (Mr. Henderson): "The people of Kingston seem to be very much afraid of my bringing Dr. Lauder here; they need not be afraid, I have no such intention."

If this be correct, and I presume Mr. Henderson will not deny that it is, if not verbatim, at any rate substantially so, I trust we shall hear no more of his Lordship's ignorance of the feelings of the congregation of St. George's relative to Dr. Lauder.

Your obedient servant,

Jan. 15th, 1863. R. J. Cartwright.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

Sir,—Permit me to correct a wrong interpretation which might possibly be put on the remarks Mr. Henderson made to me and which Mr. Cartwright refers to in your last issue. Before the Bishop's consecration, so far back as March last, and when there were reports in St. George's congregation, that the Rev. Alexander Stewart had received his dismissal, to make way for Dr. Lauder, who was to succeed him as Assistant Minister, and which caused some feelings of dissatisfaction, Mr. Henderson stated that the Bishop elect, in a conversation with him, remarked: "The congregation seem to be very much afraid of my bringing Dr. Lauder here; they need not be alarmed, I have no such intention," or words to that effect.

Mr. Henderson, before the induction, and when everyone was surmising who was to be Rector, in an answer to my inquiry, stated that he was perfectly unaware, to the best of his own knowledge the Bishop had even hinted about the appointment; and when Mr. Henderson mentioned the conversation

which took place some ten months ago respecting Dr. Lauder's not coming here as Assistant Minister, and from which we both conjectured (wrongly as it turned out) that Dr. Lauder would not be appointed.

Your obedient servant,

Kingston, Jan. 16th, 1863. G. F. LaSerre.

No attempt has ever been made to contradict Mr. LaSerre's letter, which was succeeded very shortly by a letter from Mr. Cartwright giving a sort of resumè of the evidence against the Bishop, and analysing the defence set up in Mr. Bartlett's letter of December 10th, 1862.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

Sir,—It was not originally my intention to have again addressed the public on this subject. But the general interest which has been manifested respecting it, and the evident tendency (the clergy excepted) to elevate the contest from a mere personal local squabble to an important church question, coupled with the advice of friends whose opinions I am bound to respect, induce me to believe that is on all accounts desirable that, now that it has been entered upon, it should be fully discussed.

It is, I admit, a matter of regret that the action of the Synod of Ontario in vesting the right of presentation absolutely in the Bishop debarred us, as a vestry, from taking up this affair on the higher ground of the abstract right of Christian congregations to (at least) a negative voice in the selection of their pastor for life; but though the turn things have taken will compel me to devote the great bulk of this letter to the question, how far the conduct of the Bishop did or did not warrant the proceedings of the congregation of St. George's, it is no less true that the principle involved is one of the gravest importance to the well-being of our own and, indeed, to some extent, of all our sister Protestant churches in Canada.

Moreover, as regards the conduct and character of Dr. Lewis himself, it must be remembered so long as he continues to fill his present position, it is of very considerable practical moment to some 80,000 persons (that being the number appertaining to the Church of England in this diocese) whether Dr. Lewis be an honorable and truth-telling man, or whether he be what not only I and my friends, but many of the most influential journals of this Province, have declared him to be. And I particularly request my fellow-churchmen to observe that while it would have been utterly absurd on the one hand to have expected a Bishop to submit to an investigation until such charges as might exist had been publicly stated on *primâ facie* reasonable evidence—which has been done by myself and others, though not till we had repeatedly made overtures for a reconciliation—so, on the other hand, before proceeding further, I have earnestly endeavored to persuade Dr. Lewis to submit his cause to the arbitrament of his brother prelates and their chancellors. Nor was it till after all hope of his consenting to such reference had departed, that I have had recourse to the sole remaining tribunal—to wit, that of public opinion itself.

It is unfortunately useless to deny that the question now agitating the minds of all churchmen in this diocese is nothing less than this: Can the veracity of our Bishop, Dr. Lewis be relied on or not? Nor can the most orthodox believer wonder that doubts have arisen when he discovers there are now no less than *six* several incidents or statements before the public, each wholly distinct from the other, and supported by different and independent testimony, in each of which the honor and veracity of the Bishop are distinctly impeached.

For perspecuity and fair play's sake, I shall recite them in order, and afterwards state briefly on what kind of evidence they are advanced, and how refuted and explained (if at all).

And, Firstly—The Bishop is charged with having been fully aware that Dr. Lauder's appointment would be distasteful to the congregation of St. George's—his solemn denial (see his letter of December 6th) to the contrary notwithstanding.

Secondly—He is charged with having broken the pledge he gave in the Synod room at Ottawa, to the effect that he would make no appointment distasteful to a congregation.

Thirdly—He is accused of having induced the vestry of St. George's to abstain from putting on record their strong disapproval of his Lordship's conduct in this matter, and in lieu thereof to pass a conciliatory (though *not* contradictory) resolution at the meeting of Nov. 28th, 1862, by virtual promises that if this concession were made he would then accept Dr. Lauder's resignation, which he afterwards evaded doing.

Fourthly—He is accused of mean and dishonorable conduct in the matter of the dismissal of the Rev. Alexander Stewart, and of subsequent prevarication in reference thereto.

Fifthly—He is accused of making a certain false statement in his letter of December 6th, respecting Dr. T. W. Robison, knowing the same to be false.

Sixthly—He has in his letter of October 24th, 1862, to the Bishop of Huron, staked his personal honor and veracity against that of Archdeacon Brough, in reference to a certain conversation between them, in such terms that it is manifest one or other must be guilty of a wilful untruth.

Now, it is to be noted, that so grave has been the character of the evidence against him that the entire Kingston press (with the exception of the *Argus*), although at first by no means inclined to deal hardly with his Lordship, have since severally accused him of prevarication and duplicity in editorial articles (vide the *Whig* of Dec. 5th and 15th, 1862; the *Daily News* of Dec. 9th and 31st, 1862; and Jan. 3rd and 6th 1863; and the *Herald* and *Advertiser* of Dec. 12th 1862, and Nov. 28th, 1862); and though I by no means adduce this as proof positive of his Lordship's guilt, yet I think that most dispassionate bystanders will agree that when three rival editors, having very full opportunities of hearing both sides of the question, are all found uniting on one point—viz., that his Lordship's veracity is not to be depended on, it is abundantly clear that the *primâ facie* evidence against him is enough to make it expedient for his Lordship to demand an investigation, for his honor's sake. Those who desire to examine the evidence on which the first and second, and (in part) the fourth charges rest, will find it detailed *in extenso* in my speech of December 1st, published in pamphlet form; and it is therefore enough to say here, as regards the first charge, that it was proved by Dr. Robison, that his Lordship had himself admitted that Mr. W. B. Simpson had told him that Dr. Lauder would be distasteful to to the people of St. George's, and by Mr. S. Taylor that he had deliberately paid a visit to his Lordship for the sole purpose of warning him of the self-same thing: while in addition to the direct testimony of these two gentlemen, a whole mass of circumstantial evidence was adduced to show that it was morally impossible that the Bishop should have been ignorant of the fact that Dr. Lauder was a perfect "bête noir" in the eyes of his future congregation.

In answer to this, we have, it is true, the solemn denial of the Bishop—but nothing more—unless the statement that he thought Mr. Taylor had gone out to Alwington to give the Bishop formal notice that Dr. Lauder's

appointment would be personally objectionable to him (Mr. S. Taylor), is to be deemed an explanation. If it is; all I can say is, that it would have been a most remarkable proceeding on Mr. Taylor's part; but as it is in direct contradiction to Mr. Taylor's public declaration, it seems needless to enlarge on that head.

The second charge, viz., that his Lordship pledged himself to the Synod at Ottawa that he would not use his power to appoint any one distasteful to a congregation, rests on the evidence of Messrs. Corbett, Shannon, O'Loughlin, and also on the involuntary but vabuable admission of Mr. W. B. Simpson (vide pamphlet of Dec. 1st), who all, though differing slightly as to time and wording, are agreed as to the fact of its having been made. This, however, is of less consequence, as his Lordship admits, through the mouth of his official secretary, Mr. Bartlett, in his letter to the *Whig* of Dec. 10th, that he did make such a pledge, but proceeds to explain it as follows:— "The amendment proposed by Mr. Chancellor Henderson, gave occasion to the Bishop for stating that he would not consult lay delegates nor churchwardens, *nor any other persons*, about the appointment of a Rector, but that he would not *knowingly* appoint a Rector who was *decidedly* disliked by the people."

I invite attention to the above passage. Certainly, if the Bishop did say all this, as there stated, and stuck to his determination not to consult *any person* who could inform him what the people thought, it would be almost beyond the power of man to *prove* that he had *knowingly* appointed a Rector *decidedly* disliked by the people. But I am sorry to say that the whole sentence as it stands is, from first to last, one of the most disingenuous specimens of the *suggestio falsi* which it has ever been my lot to encounter. What will your readers, what will all honest men, say when I inform them that if the testimony of half a dozen most respectable witnesses is to be believed, the foregoing sentence consists of *two totally different* observations, made at *two different* periods, and relative to *two different* subjects of discussion! which are here most unfairly blended together and made to appear as if said at the same time! Nevertheless, I am informed that such is the fact, and that while the first half of this sentence "that he would not consult lay delegates nor churchwardens nor any other persons about the appointment of a Rector," was uttered by his Lordship in reference to Mr. Henderson's amendment making it *compulsory* on the Bishop to consult the above named congregational representatives, the remaining portion, "that he would not *knowingly* appoint a Rector who was *decidedly* disliked by the people," was spoken at a quite subsequent period, after Mr. Henderson's amendment *was withdrawn*, and when the question under debate was the original one whether the Synod should retain the right of presentation or vest it absolutely and uncontrollably in the hands of the Bishop! It was then that the latter half of the sentence was uttered without one word (at that time) to the effect that the Bishop would not consult lay delegates or others, and as all the witnesses averred without the interpolation of the word "decidedly." In fact, Mr. W. B. Simpson, the Bishop's special friend, pointedly declared (see pamphlet of Dec. 1) that this pledge was made not only after the withdrawal of Mr. Henderson's amendment, but after the passage of the motion vesting the presentation in the Bishop. And it may be remarked in passing, that the recollection of the Kingston delegates may the rather be depended on, as they were probably the only laymen in the Synod who had an immediate personal interest in the matter, their Rectory being the only one then vacant. But if, contrary to all evidence, it be still maintained that his Lordship used the words Mr. Bartlett gives as his, and especially those I have emphasized, I have only to say that independent of the fact that he

can by a singular fatality be shown to have in this instance violated his pledge by *knowingly* appointing a Rector whom he knew to be decidedly distasteful to the people of St. George's, it would in my judgment, almost make his case worse that it is; since it would then be very difficult to avoid the conclusion that his Lordship had his project already cut-and-dry, and that he has been guilty of the almost incredible meanness of using language deliberately calculated to mislead those who were about to entrust him with a power to which he had no legal claim, in the full confidence that he would faithfully discharge the trust.

As respects the third charge, that his Lordship obtained an exculpatory resolution from the St. George's vestry by indirect means, it is sufficient to refer to Sheriff Corbett's letter in the *News* of Jan. 6th, from which it clearly appears, on the evidence of six witnesses, that his Lordship induced them to take up his cause (and save him the disgrace of seeing strong condemnatory resolutions recorded in the vestry book of his Cathedral Church) by representations which implied a promise of accepting Dr. Lauder's resignation. To a charge supported by such evidence, it is hard to see what an answer can be made; and even if his Lordship has any explanation to offer, what can he urge in excuse for his mean and ungenerous taunt in his letter of Dec. 6th, where he speaks of the passage of a resolution, granted to his entreaties and apparent distress, as "saving the decency of the congregation at the expense of their understanding!"

It is right to state that two other letters have appeared on this subject; but as Mr. O'Loughlin (see *News* of Jan. 7th) does not deny any statement made as a matter of fact by Sheriff Corbett, and as the Rev. Mr. Denroche is not entitled to much credit as to his version of the matter, he having tacitly acquiesced in Sheriff's Corbett's declaration to the vestry on Friday, Nov. 28th, that if this resolution passed, all difficulty would be over, I think it enough to refer any inquirer to the *News* of Jan. 6th and 7th for further particulars.

On the fourth charge, relative to his Lordship's conduct in the case of the Rev. Alexander Stewart, I shall merely say here, that there are many circumstances connected therewith known to me and others, which render it impossible for us to accept his Lordship's explanations as correct; but as this affair is wholly episodical and of local interest only, and would moreover require to be treated at some length, I think it better to defer its consideration to a future occasion, and to pass on, without further comment, to the fifth charge, which is that his Lordship, in his letter of Dec. 6th, falsely accused Dr. Robison of having made use of his (Dr. Lewis) private correspondence with the late Dean to convict his Lordship of falsehood. It is to be noted that this accusation rests solely on his Lordship's authority, and is one which, from its very nature, could only have been proved from Dr. Robison's own admissions. It would, therefore, have been quite sufficient for Dr. Robison to have denied it, as he has in his letter of December 8th. (See *News.*) But it happens, unluckily for the Bishop, that Dr. Robison is able to prove, not only that the Bishop had no right to make such an accusation, but that he actually knew it to be false several days at least before the publication of his letter of Dec. 6th. In fact, his Lordship, for some reason best known to himself, saw fit to pay Messrs. Ross and Robison a long visit on the morning of December 3rd, and after the interview, in which Dr. Robison repeated what he had already told him touching his correspondence with the late Dean of Ontario, viz., that he (Dr. R.) "had never shown any one a line of Dr. Lewis' letters since the Dean's decease," but on the contrary had scrupulously destroyed all that had come into his hands, his Lordship was pleased to express himself perfectly satisfied that Dr. Ro-

bison had acted with honesty and uprightness; and at parting tendered him him his hand, unasked, in token of his sincerity. How, after this interview, and after holding the language he then did to Dr. Robison, his Lordship could have been insane enough to bring such an accusation against that gentleman, is a matter I must leave for himself to explain. For the benefit of the public, I may as well state, however, that the only letter in Dr. Lewis' handwriting which Dr. Robison ever showed to any one, was the one alluded to in my speech of Dec. 1st—and that was given him by the late Dean several months before his death, apparently for the express purpose of proving to his friends that he was not so entirely to blame for the *abrupt* dismissal of the Rev. A. Stewart as some of them had supposed.

Of the sixth and last instance in which Dr. Lewis has contrived to put his personal word in direct antagonism with that of gentlemen of undoubted worth and position, it would be unnecessary to dwell at length, were it not that the whole tone and tenor of his letter of Oct. 24, to the Bishop of Huron from his egotistical assumption of proprietorship in "my Synod" to his deliberately charging Archdeacon Brough with a wilful and malicious falsehood (for the word "fabrication" implies no less), prove most conclusively that the Bishop of Ontario has, of all men, least just ground of complaint if his conduct and motives are severely criticised by his opponents. If they have at times forgotten the respect due to his position in the Church, Dr. Lewis might have remembered, that in dealing with Archdeacon Brough, he had to do with a man fully his equal in worth and in social standing (his Bishopric apart), and one, too, as far his superior in years and experience as he is—if we are to judge from the calm though dignified tone of his reply to Dr. Lewis' injurious aspersions—in the practice of a higher Christian morality. Surely Dr. Lewis must have lost sight of common prudence, if not of common decency, when he spoke of a man old enough to be his father, and one of the highest dignitaries of a neighboring diocese, as a "fabricator" in reference to a private conversation held between them alone, and in which no witnesses could be called.

And though, as regards the public, I am aware that I have no right to plead another's wrong-doing as an excuse for mine, yet, as regards Dr. Lewis himself, I have a right to say that if, in anything I have said or written here or elsewhere, I should prove to have spoken too severely, or to have judged his conduct too harshly, I have in so doing only too faithfully copied the example of the ecclesiastical head of this diocese.

I may have wronged his Lordship by judging of his acts and words by ordinary rules of evidence; if I have, I regret it, for his own and yet more for his office sake; but let me tell his Lordship, that but for such pamphlets as his of Oct. 23rd—such speeches as his to St. George's congregation of Nov. 24th—and last but not least, such letters as his Lordship's epistle of Dec. 6th—scarce any amount of evidence which could be possibly brought together would have sufficed to shake the time-honored reverence for his office which is rooted in the minds of the members of our Church, and which makes it almost a matter of religious belief with many, that a Bishop, like a King, can do no wrong.

One thing at least I can say, that out of respect to the feelings of those to whom I have alluded, I have omitted many things which, though they might have strengthened the case as against the Bishop, would undoubtedly have pained and shocked their minds. Still, I think even the most devoted will admit that if the statements made above are true, either the Bishop must profess and show by his acts some evident token of penitence for the wrong he has done, or it will become their duty no less than ours to do all they can to limit his powers of mischief for the future. If they are not true, then

let the Bishop or his friends put forth some more lucid refutation than they have as yet contrived to do; for whether they believe me or not, I can most sincerely assure them that not even their staunchest supporters profess themselves satisfied with what they have hitherto set before the public.

I have only further to say, that if anything above stated is false, it ought to be a very easy task to disprove it, inasmuch as all these occurrences have taken place within a very few weeks or months, and as they are set out with all possible detail of place, time and circumstance, which can facilitate detection and exposure.

Your obedient servant,

Jan. 15, 1862. R. J. Cartwright.

With this letter closed the correspondence as far as the Bishop of Ontario and the congregation of St. George's are directly concerned; and as this pamphlet does not pretend to take notice of the various side questions relative to the case of the Rev. A. Stewart, Dr. Lauder, and the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, it may suffice to refer enquirers to the pages of the Kingston papers, if anxious to investigate them in detail.

It only remains to add an extract from Dr. Lewis' letter to the Bishop of Huron, dated the 24th October, 1862, several weeks before the commencement of these difficulties and Archdeacon Brough's answer thereto.

EXTRACT.

"As regards Archdeacon Brough's statement, I have only to say that I distinctly remember the conversation he alludes to, when I did admit my dislike of the term 'glorified humanity,' on the ground that it was new to me in connection with the reception of the Eucharist, but the assertion that I called the Provost's views on this subject *heretical, I affirm to be a fabrication!*"

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF ONTARIO:

St. John's Rectory, London, C.W., December 3.

My Lord—I had placed in my hands, a few days since, your Lordship's published letter, addressed to the Lord Bishop of Huron, on the subject of the controversy connected with the theological teaching in Trinity College, Toronto, and in which you introduced my name with "fabrication." The letter found me in my bed, where I have been for some weeks past, owing to a rather severe accident.

The perusal of the document induced various impressions and purposes of mind, which I now desire to repress, and hope to forget. Had I yielded to impulse and not to principle, you can understand, I presume, the terms in which I should have met your extraordinary imputations. A little reflection, however, checked my first emotion, and let me to the contemplation of your position rather than my own personal feelings, merged into solicitude for the peace of Church, and your Lordship's character as one of her chief pastors. I accordingly desired to bow to the dictate, "recompense to no man evil for evil;" and again "avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath." I commit myself in this matter to Him who judgeth righteously, whilst I trust that it is not inconsistent with His will that I should say, in refutation of your charge, that I have fabricated nothing. And I here re-affirm what I asserted in your presence, and before the Board of Trinity College, assembled in large numbers—that in conversation with me,

on the subject of a topic contained in one of Provost Whittaker's letters, namely, the reception of the glorified humanity of the Saviour in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—you said, "It is heretical." This, my statement, you pronounced "a fabrication." I am extremely sorry you should so express yourself. The time, place, and circumstances relating to what I have set forth, are all fresh in my recollection. I should fain hope that your Lordship's memory is at fault, and I should rejoice to abide under that impression.

I make the declaration (which I have now for a second time expressed) in a chamber of indisposition, to which I am at present confined, and under a solemn sense of my responsibility to God in so doing.

You will doubtless be prepared to learn that I intend to place this letter before the public.

I am, my Lord,
Your obedient servant,
CHAS. H. BROUGH.

W. C. CHEWETT & CO., PRINTERS, 17 & 19 KING-STREET EAST, TORONTO.